DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 689 SP 033 015

AUTHOR Lakebrink, Joan M.
TITLE Teacher Preparation in Professional Development Schools.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (Atlanta, GA, February 27-March 1, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alternative Teacher Certification; Beginning Teacher Induction; *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; Masters Programs; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS DePaul University IL; Holmes Group; Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the planning and first year implementation of the DePaul-Glenview Teacher Education Program, developed in response to the perceived need by the wider educational community to strengthen the professional development of teachers. In this program, six to eight graduate students would be supported through one year of internship, during which they would complete requirements for the state teaching certificate, and two years of residency teaching, in which, along with teaching responsibilities, they would complete requirements for a Master of Arts degree. Implementation of the curriculum was the shared responsibility of the faculties of the two institutions, DePaul University and Glenview School. Candidates with a bachelors's degree, but no formal teacher preparation, were sought. Coursework and clinical experiences are described. After one year of operation, several concerns have emerged: time requirements for interns, mentor teachers, and university faculty; assessment of interns; and school district hiring and salary policies. Also, a stronger parent education component has been deemed necessary so that parents do not perceive that their child is being taught by a "student." (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED330689

Teacher Preparation in Professional Development Schools

Joan M. Lakebrink

DePaul University

Paper presented at the
American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
Annual Meeting
February 27-March 1, 1991
Atlanta, Georgia

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP033 015

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan M. Lakebrink

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Teaching other people's children is one of the most awesome responsibilities in the world. Those of us engaged in preparing these teachers also are struck with a monumental task before us. The struggle in which we are engaged has been sharpened in ours and the public's awareness by the many provocative calls for improvement in education in this nation. In A Nation at Risk (1984), the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for more effective education for America's youth and, amidst calls for more and longer school experience, it argued for the "professional development of teachers." Likewise, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, in its report A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986), recommended "collegial styles of decision making and teaching in schools."

In 1986 nearly one hundred American research universities incorporated to improve schooling through research and development and professionalization of teaching. In Tomorrow's Teachers, the consortium called the Holmes Group, declared its goals: "Make the education of teachers intellectually sound. Make better use of differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment among teachers. Create relevant and defensible standards of entry to the profession of teaching. Connect schools of education with schools. Help make schools better places for practicing teachers to work and learn" (1990, vii). This indeed, in a capsule, describes the task in which we in teacher preparation are engaged.

The Holmes Group followed with its 1990 report, Tomorrow's Schools in which it urgeds schools of education to shape their

separate identity within the university as "a professional school with strong roots in reflective practice and strong bonds to the public" (p. vii). Schools of education must forge partnerships within the university, but they cannot "emulate disciplinary departments," an expectation which is characteristically foisted upon them.

John I. Goodlad provided a thoughtful analysis of teacher preparation programs and the quick-fix alternatives promulgated by some would-be reformers of teacher education in his five year Study of the Education of Educators, Teachers for Our Nation's Schools (1990). He urged that schools of education not cut corners when preparing teachers.

The Holmes report, subtitled Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools, urged that universities and schools forge "partnerships among peers" to create "fine schools for children that will also be realistic, challenging, and supporting settings for the field studies of prospective teachers and for the rising professionalism of practicing teachers." It also urged the collaboration about problems of teaching and learning so that the curriculum and teaching at both university and school might be refreshed and reshaped.

The faculty of the School of Education at DePaul University has struggled, as have many, with making stronger links between the world of academe and the world of practice. Individual faculty members and groups of faculty have developed working relationships with administrators and faculty in particular schools in which our students could work with both faculties as

they make the connections between theory and practice, and develop their skills in specific content discipline pedagogy as well as understand better the place called school and their own future in it.

It was fortuitous when significant contact was realized with a school district that had thought through its own relationships with its teachers and other professional staff, including a move from contract to constitution with the board of education. This school district was ready to involve itself more dramatically and systematically in the formation of young teachers. They had proposed a clinical teaching model of eight years from undergraduate through Master's degree. Within a year the DePaul-Glenview Teacher Education Program was initiated. Planning for Teacher Education Partnership: The First Steps

During the Spring and Summer of 1990 planning for the joint venture began in earnest. The structure of the plan was deceivingly simple. Six to eight graduate students would be supported through three years of teaching internship and residency teaching. The university's state approved teacher education program would be used as a framework for the curriculum. The implementation of the curriculum would be the shared responsibility of the faculties of the two institutions.

Candidates with a bachelor's degree, but no formal teacher preparation, were sought. Personnel from the school district considered these persons better prepared in content area. Faculty from the university recognized that these persons already had work and life experience beyond the typical undergraduate

student, and therefore, would bring a maturity to the profession along with a varied academic background.

The criteria for admission to the program were jointly established. These included evidence of their academic ability, effective work with children, and employee effectiveness. They were also asked to respond in writing about their motivation for participation in the program, their ability to plan and implement projects, and their problem solving ability. After initial selection from documentation, ten persons were interviewed by a joint committee of university and school personnel, including teachers, principal and personnel director. Six were invited to participate.

During the summer of 1990 these students joined other graduate students in the University's teacher preparation courses on campus, including developmental psychology, characteristics of the exceptional learner, and instructional strategies for creative and critical thinking. Concurrently, groups of faculty from the two institutions met to plan the delivery of instruction for the academic year. A plan was developed based on the type of information most critical for prospective teachers at the beginning of the year through the end of the year. The early content would be related to "identifying student needs coupled with information on cooperative learning, thinking skills, and process strategies related to reading, writing, and mathematics." As the year progressed the "content would shift from diagnostic information to more in-depth information related to the content in social studies, science, and more specific information related

to reading and writing process" (Notes). Cooperative learning and thinking skill development would underpin all content.

The planning group identified that content necessary and the sequencing desired. Those faculty from both institutions envisioned to be part of the teaching during the first year were included in the deliberations. Once an overview of the year was achieved, individuals for the first quarter engaged in more specific planning for the opening of school and the initial instruction for the fall. Two seminars were scheduled for each week. The content of the seminar would be the responsibility of one, two or more DePaul and Glenview faculty. Extensive reading and written assignments were expected.

Structure of Clinical Experience

The students in the program were expected to be members of a teaching team during the academic year. The plan included a one-year internship during which they would complete requirements for the state teaching certificate (this included two summers). The second and third years would be considered residency years in which they would assume teaching responsibilities, but would be supported by university and school faculty and complete course requirements for a Master of Arts degree, including action research.

The students would be paid modest stipends for their work in the school district. The district also provided tuition support (at a somewhat discounted rate). This payment in the internship year required a variance from the State Teachers Certification Board requirements. The University requested such a variance,

based on the experimental program, and received it. Since then, a proposal for a teacher internship certificate has been discussed by the Board to be used for participants in such programs. Legislative action is expected in spring 1991.

The clinical experiences for the interns became the first crisis issue for this program. Two schools whose faculty and administration were excited about their participation in the preparation of teachers had been identified. However, as is the experience in many of these models, teachers' first responsibilities are for children, and the structure for the added responsibility in this magnitude had not yet been developed. The interns' presence in the schools created anxieties because their day-to-day operations had not been clearly structured.

The university coordinator, instructional director and two principals devised a schedule for internship placement. Specific mentor teachers were identified. A variety of settings and experiences was desired. The first rotation was a relatively short one focusing on observation; students stayed in the primary school, the intermediate school and the junior high school for three week periods of time and then were moved so they received experience in all these settings. After this nine week period, an assessment was made by the principals and university coordinator along with each intern's self-appraisal based on logs and Glenview teacher evaluation instrument.

Placements were then made for a fourteen-week period in which interns would have more direct teaching responsibilities.

Teachers, interns, principals and university coordinator discussed the interns' experiences and choices for the longer term placement. Two more placements are planned for the remaining fourteen weeks, the last placement to be in the same school in which they will be resident teachers next year.

The experiences of the interns were varied at each school. In the primary school interns rotated among team members. In the intermediate school, a mentor teacher worked with each intern; therefore, interns acted more like student teachers. They moved to other teachers for specific purposes; they were also part of the planning team.

The mentor teachers were responsible for facilitating experiences for the interns; these would be "closely tied to seminar content and reflective of individual needs and interests of the interns notes." Assessments of interns, including the final evaluation, are planned to focus on the interns' performance relative to the Glenview teacher evaluation system, along with course and seminar evaluations.

Challenges Ahead

As we move toward the end of the first year we realize we have several challenges ahead. One poignant realization was that interns are not student teachers. They do not have the educational background that student teachers have, but they do come with different life and work experiences. They, therefore, ask different questions and heighten expectations among faculty about their own work.

The necessary involvement of the entire school faculty in

teacher preparation increases the teachers' level of awareness of what teaching is all about. Professionalism is expressed in a different way. Teachers realize that the interns do not come with a wealth of knowledge so they become vested so that the interns get the preparation they need. This is a major undertaking to them. The year-long involvement makes the interns part of the staff rather than visitors to the school. They have assumed various leadership responsibilities along with district teachers.

The graduate coursework currently is pursued in seminar fashion at the close of the children's school day. This necessitates long and relatively intense days for interns, teachers and university faculty. For the interns, the focus has been on the integration of the curriculum, but teachers need to have more in-depth knowledge of content and paradigm shifts in how children can learn more. Perhaps the interns need more intense learning during the day rather than spending the entire school day in the classroom. Interns have also requested more coursework at the university.

For the participating teachers, time requirements are very pressing. Currently no recognition in terms of compensation is given for their guidance of interns. Their sense of responsibility for the interns' education is serious. Several do provide leadership and instruction in seminars for which they receive a stipend from the university. Their status within the district is being reviewed by the district; compensation may be provided in the future years of the program.

One simpler recognition on the part of the district may be some fulfillment of the requirement for continuing self-development. Grossman and McDaniel (1990), describing the Puget Sound Educational Consortium working with the University of Washington preservice teacher education program, indicated that teachers had begun to realize that their supervision "enabled them to learn more about teaching," and articulated "what they know and believe about teaching." It develops their skills in supervision and mediation between cooperating teachers and teacher candidates. Recognition on the part of the district that such participation constitutes professional development may enhance the position of these teachers and encourage more teachers to participate in the seminars.

University faculty likewise, except for the coordinator who was assigned one-third time, participated in the program planning and seminars on an "overload" basis. As this type of program becomes more integral to our teacher preparation program, this stress on faculty should be alleviated. New schemes for participation and program delivery need to be developed.

The assessment of the interns has also been a source of concern. The districts' teacher evaluation program has been used as a basis of assessment. This had been designed for experienced teachers. Teacher interns have different needs. The program planners are intending to redesign the assessment procedures.

A crucial follow-up issue was the criteria for success in the program. The program has been designed as a three-year program of teacher preparation, including induction. The

district had designed the program to eventually develop teams of teachers consisting of veteran teachers, resident teachers and interns. In order to afford the program, a differentiation in salary was necessary. Teachers who had been hired on a one-year basis while our students were interns were liable to lose their positions after that year in order to place the resident teachers. This has meant that teachers who were perceived as very good would be replaced by beginning teachers. This presented a tension concerning the evaluation of the interns. The district typically enjoys many more applicants than positions available. Could they afford to hire resident teachers who were not "outstanding candidates?" What was their responsibility to the graduate students?

This phenomenon requires much more communication among staff about the purposes, advantages, and investments of the program. Likewise, a stronger parent education component has been deemed necessary so that parents do not perceive that their child is being taught by a "student."

The program is recognized as fragile and building. Those involved in program planning and implementation and those in policy making are committed to a problem solving stance. Issues of time, reallocation of placement, intern and resident teacher support, continued enthusiasm of teachers and appropriate development for those teachers supporting interns are all currently under discussion.

As the Holmes Group reminded us, "We're trying to develop something that's never been done in an organized way, here or in

the rest of the world. We have to say in a reasonable tone of voice that we are just learning how to do this. We are inventing it as we go. This is a great ambition in the history of the world. It will be hard and take a long time." (1990, 21).

Bibliography

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A notion prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Gendler, Tamar, Wise, Arthur E. (1990). The teaching internship. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.

DePaul/Glenview Teacher Preparation Program Notes, 1990-91.

Goodlad, John I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

oundarie Grossman, Pamela L. and McDaniel, James E. (1990). "Breaking ollaborative school/university venture." Paper presented t the annual meeting of the American Educational Research ssociation, Boston.

olmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

olmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

ational Commission on Excellence in Education (1984). A nation at risk. Cambridge, MA: USA Research.